



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—CURTIUS AND ARRIAN.

PART II.

Narrative Common to Curtius and Arrian.

I. MISCELLANEOUS PASSAGES.

In many passages the Curtian and the Arrian statements coincide exactly. And this is true of individual words as well as of longer passages. Curt. 4, 1, 14 *de cetero*: Arr. 2, 14, 9 *τοῦ λοιποῦ*; Curt. 4, 15, 14 *inter haec*: Arr. 3, 13, 5 *ἐν τούτῳ*; Curt. 6, 6, 21 *strenue*: Arr. 3, 25, 6 *σπουδῇ*; Curt. 3, 11, 1 *iam ad teli iactum pervenerant*: Arr. 2, 10, 4 *εὐθὺς γὰρ ὡς ἐν χερσὶν ἡ μάχη ἐγένετο*; Curt. 7, 5, 36 *inde processit ad Tanaim amnem*: Arr. 3, 30, 7 *ἐνθεν δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν Τάναϊν ποταμὸν προῆει*. Equivalence of participial construction is also noticeable. Curt. 4, 6, 11 *praetervolans*: Arr. 2, 26, 4 *ὑπερπετόμενος*; Curt. 3, 12, 7 *iussum indicare, falso lamentari eas vivum*: Arr. 2, 12, 5 *ἐντειλόμενον φράσαι ὅτι ξῆ Δαρείος*; Curt. 5, 3, 3 *amne superato*: Arr. 3, 17, 1 *διαβὰς τὸν Πασιτίγριν ποταμὸν*; Curt. 4, 10, 9 *instructo igitur milite et composito agmine antecedeat* (Livy 21, 34, 5 *incedeat*). Sed Persarum moratores erant, mille ferme, qui speciem magni agminis fecerant: Arr. 3, 7, 7 *ξυντάξας οὖν τὴν στρατιὰν προῦχώρει ὡς ἐς μάχην· καὶ ἄλλοι αὖ τῶν προδρόμων προσελάσαντες ἀκριβέστερον οὗτοι κατιδόντες ἔφασκον δοκεῖν εἶναι σφίσι οὐ πλείους ἢ χιλίους τοὺς ἱππέας*. Curt. 7, 11, 1 *una erat petra, quam . . . obtinebat, alimentis ante congestis quae tantae multitudini vel per biennium suppeterent. Petra . . . undique abscisa et abrupta semita perangusta aditur*: Arr. 4, 18, 5 *ὡς δὲ ἐπέλασαν τῇ πέτρᾳ, καταλαμβάνει πάντῃ ἀπότομον ἐς τὴν προσβολὴν σιτία τε ξυγκεκομισμένους τοὺς βαρβάρους ὡς ἐς χρόνιον πολιορκίαν*; Curt. 7, 4, 21 *Oxo amne superato exustisque navigiis, quibus transierat, ne iisdem hostis uteretur, novas copias in Sogdianis contrahebat, which translates Arr. 3, 28, 9 Διαβὰς τὸν Ὅξον ποταμὸν τὰ μὲν πλοῖα ἐφ' ὧν διέβη κατέκασεν, αὐτὸς δὲ ἐς Ναύτακα τῆς Σογδιανῆς χώρας ἀπεχώρει*, with a *ne*-clause thrown in giving the interpretation of Curtius. We find in

Curt. 8, 10, 19 Acadira transit . . . usta et destituta incolentium fuga, although no mention is made of the burning of any other town. The explanation is that Curtius named only one of the two towns mentioned in Arr. 4, 24, 2 ἐμπήσαντες τὴν πόλιν ἔφευγον πρὸς τὰ ὄρη, and in 4, 24, 6 Καὶ ταύτην καταλαμβάνει ἐμπεπρησμένην ὑπὸ τῶν ἐνοικούντων καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους πεφευγότας.

Diodorus in 17, 38, 4-7 considers Alexander's treatment of the captive women as the greatest of his acts, because success in war comes rather διὰ τύχην ἢ δι' ἀρετήν. Arrian, closing his account of the visit to the captives, says in 2, 12, 8 Καὶ ταῦτα ἐγὼ οὕθ' ὡς ἀληθῆ οὔτε ὡς πάντῃ ἀπίστα ἀνέγραψα. ἀλλ' εἴτε οὕτως ἐπράχθη, ἐπαίνῳ Ἀλέξανδρον τῆς τε ἐς τὰς γυναῖκας κατοικτίσεως καὶ τῆς ἐς τὸν ἑταῖρον πίστεως καὶ τιμῆς· εἴτε πῦθανός δοκεῖ τοῖς συγγράψασιν Ἀλέξανδρος ὡς καὶ ταῦτα ἂν πράξας καὶ εἰπὼν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῷδε ἐπαίνῳ Ἀλέξανδρον. Curtius in 3, 12, 18-22 moralizes on the same act, discussing the proposition "hac continentia animi si ad ultimum vitae perseverare potuisset," giving a conditional setting as does Arrian. Some passages have the subjunctive for the optative in the Greek: Curt. 3, 1, 8 nisi misisset: Arr. 1, 29, 2 εἰ μὴ ἀφίκουτο; Curt. 3, 1, 16 qui . . . solvisset: Arr. 2, 3, 6 ὅστις λύσειε; Curt. 6, 5, 8 venire eos iussit, fortunam, quam ipse dedisset, habituros: Arr. 3, 23, 8 Ἐκέλευσε δὲ ἦκειν ξύμπαντας καὶ παραδιδόμει σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἐπιτρέποντας Ἀλεξάνδρῳ χρῆσθαι ὃ τι βούλοιο, ἢ σώζεσθαι ὅπῃ δύναιτο. In Curt. 6, 5, 19 the pluperfect ni reddidissent, neminem esse victurum, represents the future indicative in Arr. 5, 19, 6 Καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος προεκήρυξεν ἀνὰ τὴν χώραν πάντας ἀποκτενεῖν Οὐξίους, εἰ μὴ ἀπάξουσιν αὐτῷ τὸν ἵππον· καὶ ἀπήχθη εὐθὺς ἐπὶ τῷ κηρύγματι; cf. Diod. 17, 76, 7 ὡς ἂν μὴ τὸν ἵππον ἀποδῶσι. Curt. 8, 1, 9 si dedignaretur: Arr. 4, 15, 3 εἰ ἀπαξιῶ.

II. THE FOUNTAIN OF AMMON.

We have four different full accounts of the wonderful spring at the temple of Ammon. Two of these are in Greek—Arr. 3, 4, 2, and Diod. 17, 50, 4-5; two are in Latin—Curt. 4, 7, 22 and Pomponius Mela, Chorogr. 1, 8, 39. It is also mentioned in Pliny, N. H. 2, 228 Iovis Ammonis stagnum interdum frigidum noctibus fervet. Mela says fons media nocte fervet, mox et paulatim tepescens fit luce frigidus, tunc ut sol surgit ita subinde frigidior per meridiem maxime

riget. sumit deinde teporem iterum, et prima nocte calidus, atque ut illa procedit ita calidior rursus cum est media perfervet. Curtius has est aliud Ammonis nemus: in medio habet fontem—Solis aquam vocant. sub lucis ortum tepida manat, medio die, cuius vehementissimus est calor, frigida eadem fluit, inclinato in vesperam calescit, media nocte fervida exaestuatur, quoque nox propius vergit ad lucem, multum ex nocturno calore decrescit, donec sub ipsum diei ortum adsueto tepore languescat. The cycle in Arrian is from ἐν μεσημβρίᾳ to μεσημβρίας; in Diodorus from ἡμέρα to ἅμα τῷ φωτί; in Mela from *media nocte* to *media*; and in Curtius from *sub lucis ortum* to *sub ipsum diei ortum*. Arrian has the adjective ψυχρόν at the beginning and ψυχρότατον at the end, while Mela has *fervet* and *perfervet*, and in the use of *frigidus* . . . *frigidior*, *calidus* . . . *calidior*, resembles Arrian more than does Curtius, though the words of Curtius *inclinato in vesperam* exactly reproduce Arrian's ἐγκλίναντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἐς ἑσπέραν.

III. THE LETTERS OF ALEXANDER AND DARIUS.

The letters which passed between Alexander and Darius would furnish an excellent basis of comparison, if literal reproduction of contents had been a part of the plan of the historians. But as Arrian in 7, 25, 1 and Plutarch in Alex. 76 give the contents of the Ephemerides in widely differing form, we assume that the letters as we have them give merely the substance of the originals. They are mentioned by Diodorus in 17, 39 and 54, and are summarized by Justinus in 11, 12. Curtius in 4, 1, 4 seqq., as does Arrian in 2, 13, 8, mentions Strato, the surrender of Aradus, and the coming of Alexander to Marathos. While there (Curtius ibi), Arrian 2, 14, 1 Ἐτι δὲ ἐν Μαράθῳ Ἀλεξάνδρον ὄντος ἀφίκοντο παρὰ Δαρείου πρόσβεις, ἐπιστολὴν τε κομίζοντες Δαρείου καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀπὸ γλώσσης δεησόμενοι ἀφείναι Δαρείῳ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τοὺς παῖδας. Both Curtius and Arrian say that the request was for the mother, wife and children of Darius, but these are given in different order. According to Arrian, Darius also asked that a messenger be sent back with his own, and this messenger, Thersippus, is mentioned before the report of the reply, while Curtius gives his name after quoting the letter. Both writers state that the reply charged the Persians with bringing

war on Macedonia and Greece. Both mention Philip, the plotting of Darius against Alexander, the invitation to come to Alexander, and protection should he be afraid to do so. One statement assigned by Curtius to Alexander in sec. 13 et di quoque pro meliore stant causa, makes of general application one in Arrian 2, 14, 7 τῶν θεῶν μοι δόντων, while the last sentence, de cetero, cum mihi scribes, memento non solum regi te, sed etiam tuo scribere, slightly abbreviates the statement of Arrian in sec. 9 Καὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ ὅταν πέμπης παρ' ἐμέ, ὡς πρὸς βασιλέα τῆς Ἀσίας πέμπε, μηδὲ [ἀ] ἐξ ἴσου ἐπίστελλε, ἀλλ' ὡς κυρίῳ ὄντι πάντων τῶν σῶν φράζε εἰ του δέῃ· εἰ δὲ μή, ἐγὼ βουλευέσμαι περὶ σοῦ ὡς ἀδικούντος.

Interiecto tempore (Just. 11, 12, 3), *isdem fere diebus* (Curtius 4, 5, 1), *Ἐτι δὲ ἐν τῇ πολιορκίᾳ τῆς Τύρου ξυνεχομένον Ἀλεξάνδρον (Arrian 2, 25, 1), a message came from Darius proposing a ransom, a cession of land, and a marriage arrangement. The statement of the amount of the ransom varies, but it seems to have been ten thousand talents for each party—mother, wife, children; the cession was to extend to the Euphrates; the bride was to be the daughter of Darius. The details of the terms agree with those given by Arrian. The Alexander-Parmenio incident which is connected with the letters is associated by Curtius in 4, 11, 14, with a third letter and the words nunc Alexander de paupertate securus sum et me non mercatorem memini esse, sed regem, seem to be an expansion of Arrian's ἐπεὶ δὲ Ἀλέξανδρός ἐστιν.

IV. ANALYSIS OF BOOK III AND OTHER SECTIONS.

The first sentence in Curtius, inter haec Alexander ad conducendum ex Peloponneso militem Cleandro cum pecunia misso Lyciae Pamphyliæque rebus compositis ad urbem Celaenas exercitum admovit, is a combination of three independent statements in Arrian: 1, 24, 2 Ἐπεμψε δὲ καὶ Κλέανδρον τὸν Πολεμοκράτους ἐπὶ ξυλλογῇ στρατιωτῶν εἰς Πελοπόννησον, in sec. 3 αὐτὸς δὲ ἐπὶ Λυκίας τε καὶ Παμφυλίας ἦει, and 1, 29, 1 Καὶ ἀφικνεῖται ἐς Κελαινὰς πεμπταίος, changing two of Arrian's verbs to the ablative absolute, and summing up the results of the coming of Alexander by the word *compositis*. Like this is Curtius 5, 13, 1-2: Alexander audito Dareum movisse ab Ecbatanis, omisso itinere, quod petebat [in Mediam] fugien-

tem insequi pergit strenue. Tabas—oppidum est in Paraetacene ultima—pervenit: ibi transfugae nuntiant praecipitem fuga Bactra petere Dareum. Certiora deinde cognoscit ex Bagistane Babylonio. This also combines parts of Arrian 3, 19, 3 and 4 Ἀφικνέεται δωδεκάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐς Μηδίαν. ἐνθα ἔμαθεν οὐκ οὔσαν ἀξιόμαχον δύναμιν Δαρείῳ οὐδὲ Καδουσίους ἢ Σκύθας αὐτῷ συμμάχους ἤκοντας, ἀλλ' ὅτι φεύγειν ἐγνωκὼς εἶη Δαρείος· ὁ δὲ ἔτι μᾶλλον ἤγε σπουδῇ. ὥς δὲ ἀπείχεν Ἑκβαάνων ὅσον τριῶν ἡμερῶν ὁδόν . . . ἀπήντα ὁ Ὠχον παῖς; 3, 20, 2 Ἀφικνέεται ἐς Πάγας; and 3, 21, 1 Καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἀφικνέεται παρ' αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ Δαρείου στρατοπέδου Βαγιστάνης Βαβυλώνιος ἀνὴρ. Curtius states some of Arrian's facts a little differently, and for Πάγας has Tabas, but such changes are immaterial. The following geographical sections 2-5 and 11-13 are not from Arrian, who does give in one sentence (1, 29, 2) one-half of the citadel episode, while Curtius gives a possible complete transaction, *Alexander . . . illi, Alexander . . . (illi)*. Section 9 is Arrian 1, 29, 5, although 10, beginning with *ceterum*, is the reflection of Curtius on the course of events. The story of the cutting of the Gordian knot, which had already been given at considerable length by Pompeius Trogus (Justinus 11, 7, 3-16), is short in comparison with that given by Arrian in 2, 3, 1-8. Arrian gives λόγος as the source for the story, and it is evident that both Trogus and Curtius drew from the current account, as Justinus has *cupido eum cepit*, and Curtius *cupido incessit animo*. Also the statement in Justinus si quis solvisset, eum tota Asia regnaturum, has the order of the parts reversed in Curtius, Asiae potiturum, qui . . . solvisset. Arrian states the facts (2, 3, 1-7), and then interprets the feelings of Alexander. Curtius likewise gives the situation, circa regem erat et Phrygum turba et Macedonum, illa expectatione suspensa, haec sollicita ex temeraria regis fiducia, and then expands the statement of Arrian. And in so doing in sec. 17 beginning with *quippe*, he gives in other words what he had already stated in sec. 15 notabile erat iugum adstrictum compluribus nodis in semetipsos implicatis et celantibus nexus. Sections 22-24 give the facts in Arrian 2, 4, 1-2, and also contain a piece of information about the Veneti which was gathered from Livy 1, 1, 2-3. At this point the scene shifts to Persia, and the Alexander account is interrupted by chapters 2 and 3.

3, 1 is Arr. 2, 2, 1, and the following story is told in Plut. Alex. 18, but most of the statements gathered from another account are thrust in, breaking the continuity of the account of Curtius. This can be seen by comparing the close of chapter 1 and the beginning of chapter 4, Cappadociam petit . . . interea Alexander Abistamene Cappadociae praeposito Ciliciam petens cum omnibus copiis in regionem, quae Castra Cyri appellatur, pervenerat. Arrian has in 2, 4, 2 Αὐτὸς δὲ ἐπὶ Καππαδοκίας ἐλάσας ξύμπασαν τὴν ἐντὸς Ἄλβος ποταμοῦ προσηγάγετο καὶ ἔτι ὑπὲρ τὸν Ἄλυν πολλὴν· καταστήσας δὲ Καππαδοκῶν Σαβίκταν σατράπην αὐτὸς προῆγεν ἐπὶ τὰς πύλας τὰς Κιλικίας. καὶ ἀφικόμενος ἐπὶ τὸ Κύρου τοῦ ξὺν Ξενοφῶντι στρατόπεδον, ὡς κατεχομένας τὰς πύλας φυλακαῖς ἰσχυραῖς εἶδε, Παρμενίωνα μὲν αὐτοῦ καταλείπει σὺν ταῖς τάξεσι τῶν πεζῶν, ὅσοι βαρύτερον ὥπλισμένοι ἦσαν; see Curt. 3, 4, 15. The mention of the *castra* Cyri calls for an explanation which is not Arrian's, and is incorrect. Curtius then states the arrival of Alexander within fifty stades of the entrance to Cilicia: Pylae incolae dicunt artissimas fauces, munimenta quae manu ponimus, naturali situ imitantes. The account of Arsames then interrupts the story (sec. 3-10), and when Curtius resumes it, just as if he had not already mentioned the Pylae, he says Alexander fauces iugi, quae Pylae appellantur, intravit.

Chapter 5 gives the episode of the Cydnus, but also contains the assumed meditations of the soldiers and of Alexander in the presence of the great danger. Chapter 6 has the romance of the physician Philip, giving the interpretations of Curtius woven into the facts stated by Arrian. Some parallel passages will show the latter: Arrian 2, 4, 7 ὁ δὲ Κύδνος ῥέει διὰ μέσης τῆς πόλεως: Curt. 5, 1 mediam Cydnus amnis . . . interfuit; Arr. (sec. 8), Φίλιππον δὲ Ἀκαρνᾶνα, ἱατρόν, ξυνόντα Ἀλεξάνδρῳ: Curt. 3, 6, 1 Philippus, natione Acarnan, fidus admodum regi; Arr. (sec. 9) Τὸν μὲν δὴ παρασκευάζειν τὴν κύλικα, ἐν τούτῳ δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ δοθῆναι ἐπιστολὴν παρὰ Παρμενίωνος φυλάσασθαι Φίλιππον· ἀκούειν γὰρ διεφθάρθαι ὑπὸ Δαρείου χρήμασιν ὥστε φαρμάκῳ ἀποκτεῖναι Ἀλέξανδρον. Curt. (sec. 4) inter haec a Parmenione . . . litteras accepit, quibus ei denuntiabat, ne salutem suam Philippo committeret: mille talentis et spe nuptiarum sororis eius esse corruptum. The latter part of sec. 9, and sec. 10 of Arrian are reproduced in sections 9 and 10 of Curtius, but the remainder of the chapter is original with Curtius.

Chapter 7 opens with a statement about Darius hearing of the sickness of Alexander, and then crossing the Euphrates. The scene shifts back to Alexander, and sections 2-10 are a mosaic. The first sentence iam Alexander viribus corporis receptis ad urbem Solos pervenerat begins with an ablative absolute, Curtius' own, and closes with a translation of Arr. 2, 5, 5 ἐς Σόλους ἀφίκετο. Section 3 is worthy of notice from the form into which it is put: vota deinde pro salute suscepta per ludum atque otium reddens ostendit, quanta fiducia barbaros sperneret: quippe Aesculapio et Minervae ludos celebravit. The *quippe*-clause combines parts of two sections of Arr. 2, 5, 8-9, while the first of the sentence is the comment of Curtius on the facts. The basis of sec. 4 Myndios quoque et Caunios et pleraque tractus eius suae facta dicionis, is from Arrian, though *pleraque* stands for two towns mentioned by him. Section 5 is section 9 of Arrian, but in sec. 6 Curtius goes back to Arr. 2, 5, 1. The account of the council (sec. 8-10), and that of Sisenenes (sec. 11-15) are not from Arrian.

The first twelve sections of chapter 8 set forth a discussion among the Persians something like that about Charidemus as given in Diod. 17, 30, 2-7. It is then stated in sec. 13 forte eadem nocte et Alexander ad fauces quibus Syria aditur, et Dareus ad eum locum, quem Amanicas Pylas vocant, pervenit, although we find in 3, 7, 10 itaque inter angustias saltus hostem opperiri statuit. In the following sections Curtius expands the narrative of Arrian by giving the details of the mutilation of the captives (cf. Florus 1, 39, 7), and varies from Arr. 2, 7, 1 that there might be messengers to inform Alexander of the arrival of Darius. Then there follow two pieces of fiction, one (sec. 20-22) preceding, and the other (sec. 25-30) following a few facts.

Fränkel, pp. 105-6, calls attention to the harmony in the descriptions of the battle of Issus as given by Callisthenes, Arrian and Curtius. The last two have the same numbers, but Curtius has names not given by Arrian. In chapter 9, 3, Curtius explains Arr. 2, 8, 6 Ἐπὶ δὲ τούτοις τῶν Καρδάκ[κ]ων καλουμένων ἐνθεν καὶ ἐνθεν ἐς ἐξακισμυρίους ὀπλῖται δὲ ἦσαν καὶ οὔτοι by in subsidiis pugnacissimas locaverat gentes. The Grecian commanders are as given by Arrian in 2, 8, 3-4. The horsemen, Macedones Thessalis adiuncti, are given in reverse

order by Arrian, sec. 9 Καὶ τοὺς Θεσσαλοὺς καὶ τοὺς Μακεδόνας, just as Thraces quoque et Cretenses is the reverse of οἱ τε Κρήτες τοξόται καὶ οἱ Θράκες in Arr. 2, 9, 3. Of chapter 10 we have already spoken, but we may here add that the stages of the battle as given by Curtius in chapters 9, 10, and 11 *acies stetit, iam in conspectu*, and *iam ad teli iactum pervenerant*, reverses Arrian's arrangement of the first and second stages. The facts stated in chapter 11, the attack of the Persians on the left wing of the Macedonians, the movements of the Thessalians, the operations on the right, are as given by Arrian, but are interspersed with reflections and some extra-Arrian material. The losses given in sec. 27 in *acie autem caesa sunt Persarum peditum c milia, decem equitum*, are evidently from Arr. 2, 11, 8 Τὸ δὲ ἄλλο πλῆθος εἰς δέκα μάλιστα μυριάδας καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἵππεις ὑπὲρ τοὺς μυρίους. The number is given indefinitely by Plut., Alex. 20 Καταβαλὼν ὑπὲρ ἑνδεκα μυριάδας; and in Diod. 17, 36, 6 Κατὰ δὲ τὴν μάχην ἐτελεύτησαν τῶν βαρβάρων πεζοὶ μὲν πλείους τῶν δέκα μυριάδων, ἵππεις δ' οὐκ ἐλάττους τῶν μυρίων. The accounts by Arrian and by Curtius of what followed the battle are alike in general outlines (see Fränkel, p. 210), but differ in the order in which the different actions are given. The final chapter of Book III gives incidents and names not found elsewhere, and evidently not from the same source as the preceding; for it has in sec. 13 Oxathris—frater hic erat Darei, the writer evidently forgetting that the same information had been given in sec. 8 of chapter 11.

This analysis shows that there are four elements in the work of Curtius: a Grecian historical, a subsidiary Persian, a traditional, indicated occasionally by *fama* in Curtius and by *λόγος* in Arrian, and an original Curtian. And the sure indication of the composite character of the work is the fact that at four different points where the current of the Alexander account is interrupted, the resumption does not agree with the termination of the previous Alexander section.

Curtius also gives evidence of the composite character of his work by the use of *igitur* as a resumptive particle in welding together once unconnected facts. In Curt. 3, 4, 2 the facts are as given by Arr. 2, 4, 2, and 5 from which is gained the name Arsames. This is introduced *igitur Arsames*, and

reads as if the advice given in Diod. 17, 18, 2 had been adopted. Curt. 5, 1, 43 begins *igitur* rex . . . relinquit, the information coming from Diod. 17, 64, 4-5; but the following 65, 1 is given in Curt. 5, 1, 40. In Curt. 6, 6, 18 seqq. the facts from Arr. 3, 25, 3 and 4 are separated by a section found in Plut. Alex. 57, the particle introducing the second part from Arrian. Curt. 8, 10, 1 is connected in the same way with 8, 9, 1. Curt. 3, 7, 2-5 is an epitome of Arr. 2, 5, 5-9, *igitur* with three ablatives absolute, in the last sentence, stating what Arrian also gives with three participles.

Some breaks in the narratives of Curtius and Diodorus make it impossible to determine accurately the amount of space given to the different stages of the career of Alexander. Curtius has 79* pages from the beginning of Book III to Arbela, 127* from Arbela to India, and 68 from India to the death of Alexander. The figures for the same periods are for Diodorus 48—30*—50*, and for Arrian 80—72—175. These figures indicate for Curtius and Diodorus about equal stress on the first and third periods, the emphasis being placed by Curtius on the second, and by Arrian on the third. Had Curtius drawn only from Arrian he must have condensed for the third period and enlarged for the second. The latter is the most intensely rhetorical portion of the work of Curtius, and the speeches inserted lie largely outside the range of Arrian's account. In the third period the account of Curtius is for the most part parallel to that of Diodorus, and little use was made of Arrian. This being the case we shall consider a number of passages from the second period in order to emphasize more fully some phases of the work of Curtius.

Book V, from Arbela to the death of Darius, has only an occasional statement parallel to that of Arrian, and the same is true of the first three chapters of Book VI. Beginning with chapter 4 we shall give some passages from Curtius indicating something in regard to the genesis of the statement. The parts due to Arrian will be in Roman type, those to Diodorus in capitals, those to Curtius in italics, and those of unknown origin in brackets. Curtius 6, 4, 1-3: *summa militum alacritate iubentium quocumque vellet duceret, oratio excepta est. nec rex moratus impetum* (see Plut. Alex. 47, 13): TERTIOQUE PER PARTHIENEN DIE AD

FINES HYRCANIAE PENETRAT Cratero relicto cum iis copiis, quibus praeerat, et ea manu quam Amyntas ducebat, additis DC equitibus et totidem sagittariis, *ut ab incursione barbarorum Parthienae tueretur*. Erigyium impedimenta modico praesidio dato *campestri itinere* ducere iubet. Ipse cum phalange et equitatu CL STADIA EMENSUS castra in valle, *qua Hyrcaniam adeunt, communit*. *Nemus praealtis densisque arboribus umbrosum est pingue vallis solum rigan- tibus aquis, quae ex petris imminetibus manant*. Then follows the account of the Ziobetis, from Diodorus 17, 75, 2. It will be noticed that the beginning is found in Plutarch Ταῦτα εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ πάντες ἐξέκραγον ὅποι βούλεται τῆς οἰκουμένης ἄγειν; that the numbers are from Diodorus, and that the description of the road (Livy 21, 32, 5), of the *nemus* (Verg. Aen. 1, 165), and the *ut*-clause are due to Curtius himself. The remainder is an adaptation of a sentence in Arrian 3, 23, 2 and the following Ἐριγύιον δὲ τοὺς τε ξένους καὶ τὴν λοιπὴν ἵππον ἀναλαβόντα τὴν λεωφόρον τε καὶ μακροτέραν ἡγείσθαι ἐκέλευσε, τὰς ἀμάξας καὶ τὰ σκευοφόρα καὶ τὸν ἄλλον ὄμιλον ἄγοντα. Ὑπερβαλὼν δὲ τὰ πρῶτα ὄρη καὶ καταστρατοπεδεύσας αὐτοῦ ἀναλαβὼν τοὺς τε ὑπασπιστὰς καὶ τῆς Μακεδονικῆς φάλαγγος τοὺς κορυφαίους καὶ τῶν τοξοτῶν ἔστιν οὗς ἤει χαλεπὴν ὁδὸν καὶ δύσπορον, φύλακας τῶν ὁδῶν καταλιπὼν, ἵνα σφαλερόν τι αὐτῷ ἐφαίνετο, ὥς μὴ τοῖς ἐπομένους κατ' ἐκεῖνα ἐπιθοῖντο οἱ τὰ ὄρη ἔχοντες τῶν βαρβάρων. αὐτὸς δὲ μετὰ τῶν τοξοτῶν διελθὼν τὰ στενὰ ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ κατεστρατοπέδευσε πρὸς ποταμῷ οὐ μεγάλῳ.

Curtius 6, 4, 8 quartum iam diem eodem loco quietem militi dederat, *cum litteras Nabarzanis, qui Dareum cum Besso interceperat, accipit*. Sec. 23-24 [xxx hinc stadia proces- serat] cum Phrataphernes ei occurrit seque et eos *qui post Darei mortem profugerant*, dedens: *quibus benigne exceptis ad oppidum Arvas pervenit*. Hic ei Craterus et Erigyius occurrunt: praefectum Tapurorum gentis Phradatem addux- erant. *Hic quoque in fidem receptus, multis exemplo fuit experiendi clementiam regis*. Satrapen deinde Hyrcaniae dedit Menapin: [exul hic regnante Ocho ad Philippum per- venerat]. Tapurorum quoque gentem Phradati reddidit. Ch. 5, 21-22 Rex obsidibus acceptis Phradati parere eos iussit. [Inde quinto die in stativa revertitur]. Artabazum deinde *geminato honore, quem Dareus habuerat ei*, remittit domum.

Iam in urbem Hyrcaniae, in qua regia Darei fuit, ventum erat: ibi Nabarzanes accepta fide occurrit *dona ingentia ferens*. The last statement is from Arrian 3, 23, 4 Καὶ ἐνταῦθα ὄντος αὐτοῦ Ναβαρζάνης τε ὁ Δαρείου χιλιάρχης καὶ Φραταφέρνης ὁ Ὑρκανίας τε καὶ Παρθυαίων σατράπης καὶ ἄλλοι τῶν ἀμφὶ Δαρείον Περσῶν οἱ ἐπιφανέστατοι ἀφικόμενοι παρέδωκαν σφᾶς αὐτοῦς. ὑπομείνας δὲ ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ τέσσαρας ἡμέρας ἀνέλαβε τοὺς ὑπολειφθέντας, but in the preceding passage Arr. states that Nabarzanes, Phrataphernes and others of the most prominent Persians surrendered themselves. It is improbable that Nabarzanes wrote when the others came, and the words patriam esse, ubicumque vir fortis sedem sibi elegerit, are too much like Cicero, Tusc. Disp. 5, 37, 108 to be considered otherwise than as an exercise by Curtius himself. Sections 23–24 are from Arrian, with *Arvas* for *ἄρας* (see page 30) and Menapin for Ἀμμινάπην, Arr. 3, 22, 1. The last section corresponds partly to Arrian 3, 23, 7 and 9; and 3, 25, 1 Ταῦτα δὲ διαπραξάμενος ἤγεν ὡς ἐπὶ Ζαδράκαρτα, τὴν μεγίστην πόλιν τῆς Ὑρκανίας, ἵνα καὶ τὰ βασίλεια τοῖς Ὑρκανίοις ᾔν.

Sections 1–12 of chapter 6 give an account of the moral decline of Alexander. The remainder is from Arrian 3, 25, with the insertion of sections 14–17 giving an account of the burning of the baggage, and 26–32, the burning of the defensive hedge. The Latin of sec. 13 is namque Bessus veste regia sumpta Artaxerxen appellari se iusserat Scythasque et ceteros Tanais accolae contrahebat. Haec Satibarzanes nuntiabat. This gives almost literally a part of fourteen lines of Arrian 3, 25, 2–3, but the order is reversed: Ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ τῆς Ἀρείας ὄρια καὶ Σουσίαν, πόλιν τῆς Ἀρείας, ἵνα καὶ Σατιβαρζάνης ἦκε παρ' αὐτὸν ὁ τῶν Ἀρείων σατράπης. τούτῳ μὲν δὴ τὴν σατραπείαν ἀποδοὺς ξυμπέμπει αὐτῷ Ἀνάξιππον τῶν ἐταίρων δοὺς αὐτῷ τῶν ἵππακοντιστῶν ἐς τεσσαράκοντα, ὡς ἔχοι φύλακας καθιστάναι τῶν τόπων, τοῦ μὴ ἀδικεῖσθαι τοὺς Ἀρείους πρὸς τῆς στρατιᾶς κατὰ τὴν ἀπόδον.

Ἐν τούτῳ δὲ ἀφικνοῦνται παρ' αὐτὸν Περσῶν τινες, οἱ ἡγγελλον Βῆσσον τὴν τε τιάραν ὀρθὴν ἔχειν καὶ τὴν Περσικὴν στολὴν φοροῦντα Ἀρταξέρξην τε καλεῖσθαι ἀντὶ Βῆσσου καὶ βασιλέα φάσκειν εἶναι τῆς Ἀσίας· ἔχειν τε ἀμφ' αὐτὸν Περσῶν τε τοὺς ἐς Βάκτρα διαφυγόντας καὶ αὐτῶν Βακτριανῶν πολλοὺς· προσδοκᾶσθαι δὲ ἤξειν αὐτῷ καὶ Σκύθας ξυμμάχους.

Continuing in sections 18–22 Curtius says: Igitur Bactrianam regionem petebant. Sed Nicanor, Parmenionis filius,

subita morte correptus magno desiderio sui adfecerat cunctos. Rex ante omnes maestus cupiebat quidem subsistere funeri adfuturus, sed penuria com meatuum festinare cogebat. [Itaque Philotas cum duobus milibus et dc relictus], ut iusta fratri persolveret: ipse contendit ad Bessum. Iter facienti ei litterae adferuntur a finitimis satraparum, e quibus cognoscit BESSUM QUIDEM HOSTILI ANIMO OCCURRERE CUM EXERCITU, ceterum Satibarzanen, quem satrapeae Ariorum praefecisset, defecisse ab eo. Itaque quamquam Besso imminebat, tamen Satibarzanen opprimendum praeverti optimum ratus levem armaturam et equestres copias educit totaque nocte itinere strenue facto improvisus hosti supervenit. Cuius cognito adventu SATIBARZANES CUM DUOBUS MILIBUS EQUITUM—nec plures subito contrahi poterant—Bactra perfugit, CETERI PROXIMOS MONTES OCCUPAVERUNT. It is to be noticed that *igitur* refers, not to what immediately precedes, but to the close of the Arrian passage before the insertion of sections 14–17. Cf. Arrian 3, 25, 4–5: 'Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ὁμοῦ ἤδη ἔχων τὴν πᾶσαν δύναμιν ἦει ἐπὶ Βάκτρων, ἵνα καὶ Φίλιππος ὁ Μενελάου παρ' αὐτὸν ἀφίκετο ἐκ Μηδίας, ἔχων τοὺς τε μισθοφόρους ἱππέας, ὧν ἡγείτο αὐτός, καὶ Θεσσαλῶν τοὺς ἐθελοντὰς ὑπομείναντας καὶ τοὺς ξένους τοὺς Ἀνδρομάχου. Νικάνωρ δὲ ὁ Παρμενίωνος ὁ τῶν ὑπασπιστῶν ἀρχὼν τετελευτῆκει ἤδη νόσῳ. ἰόντι δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τὴν ἐπὶ Βάκτρα ἐξηγγέλθη Σατιβαρζάνης ὁ Ἀρείων σατράπης Ἀνάξιππον μὲν καὶ τοὺς ἱππακοντιστὰς τοὺς ξὺν αὐτῷ ἀπεκτονῶς, ὀπλίζων δὲ τοὺς Ἀρείους καὶ ξυνάγων εἰς Ἀρτακόανα πόλιν, ἵνα τὸ βασιλείον ᾦν τῶν Ἀρείων· ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ὅτι ἔγνωκεν, ἐπειδὰν προκεχωρηκότα Ἀλέξανδρον πύθεται, ἰέναι ξὺν τῇ δυνάμει παρὰ Βῆσσον, ὡς ξὺν ἐκείνῳ ἐπιθυσόμενος ὅπῃ ἂν τύχῃ τοῖς Μακεδόσι. ταῦτα ὡς ἐξηγγέλθη αὐτῷ, τὴν μὲν ἐπὶ Βάκτρα ὁδὸν οὐκ ἔγινε . . . σπουδῇ ἔγινε ὡς ἐπὶ Σατιβαρζάνην τε καὶ τοὺς Ἀρείους καὶ διελθὼν ἐν δυσὶν ἡμέραις σταδίου εἰς ἐξακοσίους πρὸς Ἀρτακόανα ἦκεν. In the passage of Curtius Νικάνωρ δὲ becomes *sed Nicanor*, ἰόντι *iter facienti*, σπουδῇ *strenue*, while *improvisus* stands for the time and distance of the march. Curtius 6, 6, 33–34, 36 Hinc ad Craterum, qui Artacoana obsidebat redit. *ille omnibus prae paratis regis expectabat adventum captae urbis titulo, sicut par erat, cedens. Igitur Alexander turre ad moveri iubet: ipsoque ad spectu barbari territi, e muris supinas manus tendentes* (Caes. B. C. 2, 5, 3), *orare coeperunt, iram in Satibarzanen,*

defectionis auctorem, reservaret, supplicibus semet deditibus parceret. Rex data venia non obsidionem modo solvit, sed omnia sua incolis reddidit . . . Hac manu adiecta ADIT DRANGAS. *Bellicosa natio est.* Satrapes erat Barzaentes, sceleris in regem suum particeps Besso: is suppliciorum, quae meruerat, metu profugit in Indiam. In sections 25-32 Curtius states that Craterus captured a cliff which Alexander had left for him to besiege. Then without previous mention he speaks of the return to Artacoana, which Alexander reached according to Arr. 3, 25, 5, while sec. 8 of Arrian gives the content of the last sentence quoted from Curtius.

Original Arrian Element in Curtius.

More equivalent passages are given by Dosson, pp. 141-143, and, assuming that Arrian followed Curtius, he argues that Curtius must have made use of Aristobulus and Ptolemy, who furnished the larger part of the contents of the *Anabasis*. The closeness with which the Latin follows the Greek at many points leaves no room for doubt that Curtius made use either of Arrian or of the writers from which Arrian drew. One or the other alternative must be accepted. Against the conclusion of Dosson we advance the theoretical objection that it makes the Roman writer the originator of the method of the Greek in correcting the history of Alexander by introducing in fuller measure the accounts written by Aristobulus and Ptolemy. And of most interest are the little pieces of information common to Arrian and Curtius, and not given by Aristobulus. However, one piece of information from Aristobulus is very noticeable. Arr. 4, 13, 5 relates that some say that Alexander drank till daybreak, but Aristobulus tells of the Syrian woman who led him to drink all the night. Curt. 8, 6, 12 seqq. blends the two statements and modifies the last: *Et ille per ludum bene deos suadere respondit revocatisque amicis in horam diei ferme secundam convivii tempus extraxit.*

The work of Ptolemy seems to have been used but little by the Alexander romancers, and it remained for Arrian to call attention to its real value. This renders of more importance some Ptolemaic passages which Curtius may have gotten through Arrian. The accounts given by Diodorus in 17, 67; by Arrian in 3, 17; and by Curtius in 5, 3, 1-15 agree in the

main, but only Curtius and Arrian mention the part taken by the mother of Darius; and for this piece of information Arrian expressly names Ptolemy as his authority. The last sentence in Curtius is a combination of the facts stated by Arrian combined with the conclusions of Curtius. We have a fourfold description of the seizure and fate of Bessus. Diodorus closes with the word *διεσφενδόνησαν*, and then comes a break in his narrative. Plutarch Alex. 43 has this last word of Diodorus, and then continues *Ὀρβίων δένδρων εἰς ταὐτὸ καμφθέντων ἐκατέρῳ μέρος προσαρτήσας τοῦ σώματος, εἶτα μεθεῖς ἐκάτερον, ὡς ὄρμητο ῥύμη φερόμενον, τὸ προσήκον αὐτῷ μέρος νείμασθαι. Τότε δὲ τοῦ Δαρείου τὸ μὲν σῶμα κεκοσμημένον βασιλικῶς πρὸς τὴν μητέρα ἀπέστειλε*, a variation of the punishment, which, according to Livy, I, 29, 10, was inflicted on Mettius. Of this punishment Curtius and Arrian indicate nothing, and both divide the account into two parts. Arrian in 3, 30, 5, from Ptolemy, says that Bessus was sent into Bactria, and he states in 4, 7, 3 *Ἐνθα δὲ ξύλλογον ἐκ τῶν παρόντων ξυναγαγὼν Ἀλέξανδρος παρήγαγεν ἐς αὐτοὺς Βῆσσον· καὶ κατηγορήσας τὴν Δαρείου προδοσίαν τὴν τε ῥῖνα Βῆσσου ἀποτμηθῆναι καὶ τὰ ὦτα ἄκρα ἐκέλευσεν, αὐτὸν δὲ ἐς Ἑκβάτανα ἀγεσθαι, ὡς ἐκεῖ ἐν τῷ Μῆδων τε καὶ Περσῶν ξυλλόγῳ ἀποθανούμενον*.

Curtius in 7, 5, 36-43 describes the reception of Bessus by Alexander, and states in sec. 40 the command, *ut cruci adfixum mutilatis auribus naribusque sagittis configerent barbari adservarentque corpus, ut ne aves quidem contingerent*. But according to sec. 43 the punishment was deferred, *ut eo loco, in quo Dareum ipse occiderat, necaretur*. In 7, 10, 10 it is stated, *Bactra pervenit. inde Bessum Ecbatana duci iussit . . . poenas persoluturum*, a translation of Arr. 4, 7, 3, given above. With these can be placed Curt. 8, 1, 19=Arr. 4, 17, 3 (Fränkel, pp. 278 and 290), and Curt. 8, 5, 1=Arr. 4, 22, 2 (Fränkel p. 279), the last passage from Curtius being noticeable for the change in the order of the names as given by Arrian.

In 6, 13, 4 Arrian gives an account from Nearchus of the criticisms of Alexander by his friends for the risks he ran in battle. In connection with the incident Arrian remarks *Καὶ ὁμως ὑπὸ μένους τε τοῦ ἐν ταῖς μάχαις καὶ τοῦ ἔρωτος τῆς δόξης, καθάπερ οἱ ἄλλης τινὸς ἡδονῆς ἐξηγτώμενοι, οὐ*

καρτερὸς ἦν ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν κινδύνων. Curtius puts the criticism into a long harangue by Craterus (9, 6, 6-14), with a still longer reply by Alexander (sections 17-26). In this he develops the idea given by Arrian, saying in sec. 19 ego me metior non aetatis spatio, sed gloriae (see Cic. Archias 11), and in sec. 21 adapts a statement from Cic. Verr. 5, 14, 45 ego vero non deero et, ubicumque pugnabo, in theatro terrarum orbis esse me credam.

We find in Curt. 8, 1, 9 that the Scythian king offered his daughter in marriage to Alexander. Arr. 4, 15, 2 gives the same information, probably following Plut. Alex. 46, where a letter of Alexander to Antipater is given as authority for the statement. Likewise in Plut. Alex. 47, from the same source, mention is made of a movement among the Greek soldiers, a speech of Alexander, and the effect on the soldiers. Curtius writes of all these from 6, 2, 15 to 4, 1 inclusive.

To assume that Curtius independently of Arrian and Plutarch selected these statements out of the mass of writings giving the history of Alexander is to credit him with a care in historical matters which is belied at every turn. But of even more importance is the use made by Curtius of purely Arrian material. Arrian often gives the source for statements found outside of Aristobulus and Ptolemy. This is frequently the λόγος, as in 3, 2, 1; and 4, 28, 1, for which Curtius has *fama* in corresponding passages, 4, 8, 6; and 8, 11, 2. Arr. 4, 1, 1 cites Homer as an authority, and in Curt. 7, 6, 11 *constabat* is given as the basis of the assertion. Akin to this is the statement in Curt. 8, 10, 12 *montis, quem Meron incolae appellant. Inde Graeci mentiendi traxere licentiam, Iovis femine Liberum Patrem esse celatum.* The basis for this criticism is given in an address to Alexander by an Indian in Arr. 5, 1, 6 *Τὸ δὲ ὄρος ὃ τι περ πλησίον ἐστὶ τῆς πόλεως καὶ τοῦτο Μηρόν ἐπωνόμασε Διόνυσος, ὅτι δὴ κατὰ τὸν μῦθον ἐν μηρῷ τοῦ Διὸς ἠῤῥέθη.* Pliny, N. H. 6, 79 has the mild statement *unde origo fabulae Iovis femine editum*, and also Mela 3, 66 *unde Graecis auctoribus ut femori Iovis insitum dicerent aut materia ingessit aut error.* We find in Curt. 5, 5, 3 *nullam virtutem regis iustius quam celeritatem laudaverim*, brought in at a point where Arrian has *σπουδῇ*, a word which he frequently uses, as in 3, 19, 4, where Curtius at the same point in

the narrative has in 5, 8, 2 *adversus celeritatem*; cf. Florus 1, 41, 15 *quid prius in hac mirere victoria? velocitatem? . . . an felicitatem?* The last words of Curtius in 10, 10, 20 *omnis memoriae ac nomini honos habitus*, seem an epitome of the last chapter of Arrian to the words 7, 30, 2 *μνήμη οὐκ ἀνθρωπίνη*.

We have the work of Diodorus and the Epitome of Pompeius Trogus by Justinus, both without ethical estimates of the work of Alexander. In contrast with these, both Arrian and Curtius give the ethical measure of Alexander, and in this they agree. It takes a score of superlatives for Arrian in 7, 28, 1-3 to express his high regard; and other judgments are scattered throughout the work. In 2, 12, 8; 3, 10, 4; 4, 9, 2; 4, 9, 6; and 6, 26, 3 we find *ἐπαινῶ* 'Ἀλέξανδρον, or an equivalent; and with a negative in 4, 7, 4; and 5; 4, 8, 5; and 4, 12, 6. There are also other forms of expressing his convictions in regard to the actions of Alexander, as in 3, 18, 12, 'Ἄλλ' οὐδ' ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ σὺν νῶ δρᾶσαι τοῦτό γε 'Ἀλέξανδρος οὐδὲ εἶναι τις αὕτη Περσῶν τῶν πάλαι τιμωρία. These passages indicate that he considered the passing of ethical judgments as one of the functions of a historian; and Curtius proceeds along the same line. His final judgment on Alexander in 10, 5, 27 presents, like that of Arrian, a series of laudable elements of character: *vis incredibilis animi, laboris patientia propemodum nimia, fortitudo, liberalitas, clementia, mortis contemptio, gloriaeque laudisque cupido, pietas erga parentes, benignitas, benevolentia, consilium par magnitudini animi, sollertia, modus immodicarum cupiditatum, veneris intra naturale desiderium usus, nec ulla nisi ex permissis voluptas—ingentes profecto dotes erant.* Over against these fifteen "*bona naturae*" are put the few "*vitia vel fortunae vel aetatis*," the desire for divine honors, anger at those scorning to worship him, imitation of the customs of conquered tribes, "nam iracundiam et cupidinem vini sicuti iuventa inritaverat, ita senectus mitigare potuisset." This last defect is mentioned again in the shorter catalogue of his virtues given in 5, 7, 1 *ceterum ingentia animi bona, illam indolem, qua omnes reges antecessit, illam in subeundis periculis constantiam, in rebus moliendis efficiendisque velocitatem, in deditis fidem, in captivos clementiam, in voluptatibus permissis quoque et usitatis temperantiam*

haud tolerabili vini cupiditate foedavit. Here and there throughout the work are scattered references to other virtues and to other vices, as are also some indications of Alexander's return to his better self. It is said of him in 5, 7, 11, after the destruction of Persepolis, paenituisse constat (cf. Plut. Alex. 38); in 8, 8, 23, after the death of Callisthenes, quam crudelitatem sera paenitentia secuta est; and in 8, 2, 3, after the murder of Clitus, paenitentiam solitudo exciebat, the last corresponding to the remark in Arr. 4, 9, 2 ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖσδε αὐτῷ ἐπαινῶ Ἀλεξάνδρου, ὅτι παραντίκα ἔγνω σθένειον ἔργον ἐργασάμενος.

Plutarch De Alexandri Magni Fortuna aut Virtute, 342 F has Αὐτὸς δ' εἶχεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὰς μεγάλας ἐλπίδας, beginning with ἐλπίδας, while Curtius closes with *dotes* (10, 5, 32). The remainder of the section names most of the traits mentioned by Curtius, and there are then given the predominant characteristics of Cyrus, Agesilaus, Philip, Brasidas, Pericles, Agamemnon, Achilles, Diomedes and Ulysses. This section is summarized by Curtius: Fortitudo, non inter reges modo excellens, sed inter illos quoque, quorum haec sola virtus fuit (10, 5, 27); cf. indolem, qua omnes reges antecessit (5, 7, 1). The comment of Curtius on Fortune, quam solus omnium mortalium in potestate habuit (10, 5, 35), is practically the same as Plutarch's in 340 A καὶ γὰρ εἰ διὰ Τύχην μέγας γέγονε, μείζων ἐστὶν ὅτι τῇ Τύχῃ καλῶς κέχρηται. We do not know of any prototype in characterization for Plutarch and Curtius, as there is no indication of one in either Aristobulus or Clitarchus so far as they are made known to us by Arrian or by Diodorus. In the absence of any such indications the work of Curtius must be judged in the light of its relation to Plutarch and Arrian. The latter evidently gleaned from the former and massed the material. The method of Curtius was the same, but he translated the nouns of Plutarch rather than the adjectives of Arrian. The judgment of the three is a unity in substance, and in form differs only as nouns differ from adjectives.

The description of the Caucasus in Curt. 7, 3, 19-21 seems based on the apparently original collection in Arr. 5, 5. The utilization of this by Curtius is evident not only from individual expressions, *Asiam dividit: ἀπείργειν τὴν Ἀσίαν*; *Taurus . . . committitur Caucaso: (ξυνεχῆς) τοῦτ' ὁ Ταῦρος*; *omnia fere*

flumina: ὅσοι . . . λόγον ἀξίωι, but also from the selection and arrangement of the names.

We find in Curt. 9, 5, 21 Ptolemaeum . . . huic pugnae adfuisse auctor est Clitarchus et Timagenes. Sed ipse, scilicet gloriae suae non refragatus, afuisse se missum in expediti-onem memoriae tradidit. Tanta componentium vetusta rerum monumenta vel securitas vel, par huic vitium, credulitas fuit! Curtius in this comment unwittingly criticises himself, and the criticism is certainly based on Arr. 6, 11, 8 Καίτοι αὐτὸς Πτολεμαῖος ἀναγράφεν οὐδὲ παραγενέσθαι τούτῳ τῷ ἔργῳ, ἀλλὰ στρατιᾶς γὰρ αὐτὸς ἡγούμενος ἄλλας μάχεσθαι μάχας καὶ πρὸς ἄλλους βαρβάρους. ταῦτα μὲν δὴ ἐν ἐκβολῇ τοῦ λόγου ἀναγεγράφθω μοι, ὥς μὴ ἀταλαίπωρον γίγνεσθαι τοῖς ἔπειτα ἀνθρώποις τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν τηλικούτων ἔργων τε καὶ παθημάτων ἀφήγησιν. Although Arrian here names Ptolemy, Fränkel, p. 49, assigns this to Eratosthenes, a misinterpretation based on a misinterpretation (p. 47) of the extent of a quotation by Plutarch from this writer.

Arrian in 7, 5, 6 states that for services rendered Nearchus and Onesicritus were crowned, and the latter is designated τὸν κυβερνήτην τῆς νεῶς τῆς βασιλικῆς. He also says in 6, 2, 3 Τοῦ μὲν δὴ ναυτικοῦ παντὸς Νέαρχος αὐτῷ ἐξηγείτο, τῆς δὲ αὐτοῦ νεῶς κυβερνήτης <ἦν> Ὀνησίκριτος, ὃς ἐν τῇ ξυγγραφῇ, ἣντινα ὑπὲρ Ἀλεξάνδρου ξυνέγραψε, καὶ τοῦτο ἐψεύσατο, ναύαρχον ἑαυτὸν εἶναι γράψας, κυβερνήτην ὄντα. Curtius observes the same order in 9, 10, 3; and 10, 1, 10. Diodorus in 17, 104, 3 Τὸν δὲ λοιπὸν στόλον παραδοὺς Νεάρχῳ καὶ τισιν ἄλλοις τῶν φίλων, though not mentioning Onesicritus seems to make him equal with Nearchus. Pliny has in N. H. 6, 81 Onesicritus classis eius praefectus; and in 6, 96 and 109 Onesicritus et Nearchus, but in reverse order in 6, 124. The statements of Diodorus and Pliny show that the common view was that Onesicritus and Nearchus were equal in command, and it was only from Arrian that Curtius could get the information to correct the mistake. Stronger evidence of the indebtedness of Curtius to Arrian is furnished by Curtius 9, 5, 21 and Arrian 6, 11, 2 Πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἀναγράφεται τοῖς ξυγγραφεῦσιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ παθήματος, καὶ ἡ φήμη παραδεξαμένη αὐτὰ κατὰ τοὺς πρώτους ψευσαμένους ἔτι καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς διασώζει, οὐδὲ ἀφήσει παραδιδούσα καὶ ἐφεξῆς ἄλλοις τὰ ψευδῇ, εἰ μὴ ὑπὸ τῆςδε τῆς ξυγγραφῆς παύσεται.

The above remarks would be uncalled for if Curtius had already corrected the mistake. The general remark of Arrian

suggested to Curtius the putting of Clitarchus and Timagenes on the pillory, and he followed the same course as did Plutarch with the statements in regard to the Queen of the Amazons. But more than this. The mention of Ptolemy shows that at this point he has abandoned the accounts of Clitarchus and Onesicritus, and is drawing directly from Arrian 6, 11, 8, the latter part of the passage being expressed in Curtius by the one phrase *in expeditionem*. That the work of Curtius is a composite one is clearly evident. And to this are due some of its defects. Editors call attention to the fact that the lack of clearness in the description of the battle of Issus (3, 9) and of the movements of Darius (5, 8) arises from an attempt to combine the accounts of Diodorus and of Arrian. His account becomes still more involved when there is an added Roman element. Ariobarzanes is mentioned in Arr. 3, 8, 5 as a Persian commander at Arbela, and later (3, 18, 2) as a Persian satrap at the Gates of Persia. Later a man of the same name and son of Artabazus came to Alexander. (Compare in Arr. 2, 11, 8 Arsames, killed at Issus, and in 3, 23, 7 A. son of Artabazus.) If this was the satrap it is passing strange that Alexander did not make use of his services, as he did of those of his father. But according to Curt. 5, 4, 34 Ariobarzanes was killed at Persepolis. The accounts in Diod. 17, 68 and Arr. 3, 18 agree in the main, though that of Arrian is the fuller. They disagree in regard to the time when the bridge was made across the Araxes. Neither mentions the death of the Persian leader. Curt. 5, 4, 33 says that he fled with about forty horsemen and 5000 footmen to Persepolis, was shut out from the city, and *consecutis strenue hostibus*, all were slain. "Craterus quoque raptim agmine acto supervenit (chap. 5, 1). Rex eodem loco, quo hostium copias fuderat, castra communit," then pressed on with the cavalry, arrived at the Araxes at daybreak, and built the bridge. According to Livy 21, 32, 11-13 Hannibal had encamped in the mountains after a fight, and it was proper that Alexander should do the same thing. But the movements of the Persians across the river without a bridge when a Macedonian force was building one, the movement of Craterus, the defeat of Ariobarzanes, the meeting with the mutilated Greeks, are points which Curtius does not harmonize.

From what source came the incentive to produce the work we can not tell. Cicero was familiar with the history of Alexander (see de Div. 2, 66, 135), and this had been given to the Romans somewhat in detail by Pompeius Trogus in the reign of Tiberius.¹ Following writers reproduced some of the episodes. And we are told in Apuleius, Flor. 1, 7, 24 eius igitur Alexandri multa sublimia facinora et praeclara edita fatigaberis admirando vel ausa vel domi provisa, quae omnia aggressus est meus Clemens, eruditissimus et suavissimus poetarum, pulcherrimo carmine illustrare. The subject was ever at hand for any writer who wished to show his skill in developing it.

But the question has been asked whether a writer after the time of Arrian could have used the vocabulary found in the history of Alexander. Curtius went to his work with a mind steeped in the phraseology of classical writers, and it is this which he largely reproduces. The possibility of such a reproduction can be shown by a single illustration. It has been said of Kossuth, "He used the English tongue so newly acquired by him with a rhetorical splendor and force that seems to us . . . little less than supernatural; when one remembers that so idiomatic a power had been won by him alone in a prison cell in a few weeks and with the Bible and Shakspeare's plays for almost his only text-books."

But in Curtius are found constructions and thoughts of a period later than the classical. There are quoted Cic. Rosc. Am. 50, 145 aliena misericordia vivo; and Pliny, Ep. 3, 19, 9 and Pan. 10, 4 iam te providentia deorum primum in locum provexerat. And the two ideas are combined in Curt. 6, 9, 2 deum providentia et misericordia vivo. By the time of Tacitus the *misericordia principis* was clearly recognized, but we can not tell when the transfer to *misericordia dei* (in Curtius necessarily *deum*) was made from the early Christian writers. Curtius was a rhetorician rather than a historian, and to him historical verity was less important than rhetorical coloring, and his success must be judged by the extent to which he attained the latter. The works of Diodorus and of Pompeius Trogus were before him when he wrote and we believe those of Plutarch and of Arrian also. There are in Curtius many personal items which apparently indicate some unknown

¹ A. J. P. XXXVIII 20.

source, as the mention of Cleo instead of Anaxarchus in 8, 5. But in Justinus there are several peculiar personal touches, and in 12, 6, 14 an imaginary list of names that came to the mind of Alexander. Judging by Justinus the work of Pompeius Trogus must have been rich in the personal element, and we may safely assume that like the work of Livy it was freely used by Curtius. On this basis we may claim that to Pompeius Trogus is due the list of names given in Curt. 5, 2, 5. The entire chapter giving the events following the stay at Babylon, which Curtius in 5, 1, 36-39 represents as a Capua to Alexander, is based on Diod. 17, 65. Reinforcements came from Antipater (Diod. sec. 1) under the command of Amyntas Andromeni (Arr. 3, 16, 10). Five days later the army entered Sittacene (Diod. sec. 2), and some changes were made in the military organization, τῆς στρατιωτικῆς τάξεως ἐπιμεληθῆναι (Diod. sec. 2), and ἐ. τῆς ἰδιωτικῆς τῶν στρατιωτῶν διατάξεως (Diod. sec. 4). Curtius incorporates an epitome of Arr. 3, 16, 11, and gives the names of the eight victors in the contests. But sec. 3 has chiliarchas vocabant, based on the mention of the *chiliarchia* in Arr. 3, 29, 7 and 4, 24, 10, and sec. 4 is his own interpretation of the situation. Here we have the blending of material certainly from two secondary sources, and we believe from three, with his own interpretation added. It is by these interpretations that he has given color to the entire work, and has shown that he has an imagination akin to that which enabled Apuleius to portray the career of the transformed Lucius. And there is no need of conjuring up an intermediate *Verfasser*—a veritable *auctor ex coniectura*—to account for changes from sources which Curtius, just as easily as he, might either wittingly or unwittingly have made.

There were added also literary touches to heighten the artistic effect. Vergil wrote in the Georgics 4, 212

*Rege incolumi mens omnibus una est;
Amisso rupere fidem*

and the words were taken as an illustration by Seneca, Ep. 114, 23; and de Clem. 1, 4, 1. Curtius, getting the thought either from Vergil or from Seneca, takes it to adorn the narrative in 4, 15, 24 Curru Dareus, Alexander equo vehebatur.

Utrumque delecti tuebantur sui immemores quippe amisso rege nec volebant salvi esse nec poterant.

If we correctly understand his aim the value of facts would not justify him in gleaning them from many authors. In one passage he mentions Ptolemy, Clitarchus and Timagenes, but Arrian gives the first as authority for the same fact, and Curtius names the others as guilty of the charge made by Arrian. It is possible that either Arrian or Curtius may have changed the order of terms as given by an earlier writer, and a different arrangement may not indicate that Curtius purposely varied from Arrian. But a thorough-going comparison of the vocabulary of Diodorus and of Arrian shows that the two writers were entirely independent of each other. An equally thorough examination of the works of Arrian shows that all the elements have been reduced to uniformity. Because of this there is very little probability that Arrian drew from any source the identical words which Curtius has either translated literally, or varied in the Latin words. We cannot believe that Curtius by using Aristobulus and Ptolemy established a method of procedure for Arrian. As Curtius sets forth material found in Arrian in exactly the same way as he does that which he derived from Livy, the assumption that he followed Arrian seems to be valid. And it is this assumption alone that renders possible a uniform interpretation of all phases of his work.

R. B. STEELE.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY, NASHVILLE, TENN.